

carpentry, manufacturing, where women comprise less than 25 percent of the workforce. Jobs would provide long-term employment, they generate pay between \$14 and \$35 an hour, provide medical care, retirement benefits. To do that, all we would have had to do was to give governors the flexibility to direct resources to train one-stop employment center employees, help them to be trained so that they can help women find these jobs and others find these jobs. The Republican majority response? No.

The simple truth is that this bill abandons workers. It does nothing to stop these families from falling through the cracks.

Turn aside the rule. Let us pass a workforce bill that prepares our workforce and gives them the tools for economic security for themselves and for their families.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 9½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. It is interesting that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) was asked the question. Maybe the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) can answer it. Why not let us bring up the amendment on the issue they were discussing?

And another issue that is not being brought up today that should have been is the unemployment situation in this country: 341,000 people lost their jobs in April, almost 9 million people out of work.

This Congress, this House, this majority sits idly by. There is going to be the expiration of unemployment benefits, the extended benefits the end of this month. And there is over \$20 billion in the trust fund that could be applied to help these people. Oh, it is said the answer is get a job. These unemployed people are looking for a job.

A recent survey indicated that the average unemployed worker has applied for 29 jobs without finding work, and you sit idly by and do nothing. It also shows the average unemployed worker over 45 has applied for 42 jobs without finding work. Stop sitting and act on this issue.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Right now Oregon has 7.6 percent unemployment, the highest in the Nation. In March of this year food and trans-

portation lost manufacturing jobs, 800 jobs. These hardworking men and women are not statistics. They are real people with real lives and families, and right now they are facing the prospects of not having enough money to put food on the table, and they lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

We should not cut the very initiatives that help them retain these new jobs that will pay them decent wages and offer them health benefits.

The Dislocated Worker Program of the Workforce Investment Act is critical to making sure our States have the resources to keep dislocated workers from falling through the cracks, and it is imperative that we make sure it remains a separate program because it is a training program and its needs are very different from the other two programs with which it is being combined.

I have put forth an amendment with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) that would have addressed this issue and ensure that those who are laid off can get the assistance they need to get back into the workforce. Yet the Committee on Rules refused to give the Members a chance to vote on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, if there is any issue in Congress that should rise above partisanship, it should be the principle of religious freedom. I hope every Republican and Democrat in the House before voting on this rule asks his or herself this question: Is it right that an American citizen be denied a federally funded job simply because of his or her religious faith?

If you think that is right, then you should vote for this rule because that is what this bill does. It denies American citizens publicly funded jobs simply because of their choice of religious faith. If you agree with the vast majority of Americans that it is wrong to subsidize religious discrimination with federal tax dollars, vote "no" on this rule.

This is more important than sticking to the sacred altar of partisanship. The issue of religious freedom should rise above that altar of partisanship. And I hope my Republican colleagues will join with Democrats and all of us today to say we are going to stand up for religious freedom during the week we are preaching it to the Iraqi citizens.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, from listening to the other side, you would think that this was something that was run-of-the-mill, that we took away these protections every day and have in the past. That is just not true.

This is the first time this Congress will eliminate, delete language in our statutes, in our laws that expressly

prohibits discrimination in these programs based on religion. It is the first time we will remove a protection that this body has decided is important and fundamental to American principles of operation of church and State.

As has been stated, this language was first signed into law in 1982 by Ronald Reagan. It was readopted in 1998 by this House of Representatives. And it continues to make sense to every American out there that their tax dollars should not go to discriminate when it comes to federal programs that are secular in nature.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed that this full House is not given the opportunity to debate this full issue and vote up and down.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many more speakers the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) has.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we do not have any other speakers on the floor. There may be more coming; but if the gentleman is prepared, we can close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if people want a dictionary illustration of adding insult to injury, the Republicans are providing it. They do great injury today to the principle of nondiscrimination, and they have added to that the insult of not allowing this House to debate it.

As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) made clear, this is the first time we will be removing from the statute books an existing antidiscrimination provision, one that says you cannot take Federal money and then discriminate against some of the people who paid the taxes. If you are a particular organization, you can say, I do not care if you are Jewish and pay taxes or Catholic and pay taxes. I do not care if you are a Protestant and pay taxes, if you believe in abortion. I do not care if you are a Methodist and pay taxes, if you agree on evolution. We will exclude you.

It is appalling to me that they are going to be able to engineer this enormous regression in the principle of nondiscrimination without there even being a separate vote and debate. It is a tribute to the Republican majority, the most submissive body of elected officials gathered since the dissolution of the Supreme Soviet that they will ratify this decision to roll back a fundamental constitutional provision, a fundamental antidiscrimination public policy provision, and they will all march down and vote not to allow it to be debated.

The gentleman from Ohio is right. In 1965 there was an exemption for religion organizations, and it was expanded in 1972. A Senator said at the time, "This is to keep the hands of Caesar off of the place of God."

Now we are talking about the hands of Caesar coming to the religious institutions bearing money. And we were